DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 964 UD 017 789

AUTHOR	Tompkins, Rachel B., Ed.
TITLE	The Media and School Desegregation.
INSTITUTION	Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, Cleveland.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[77]
GRANT	NIE-P-76-0259
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Dissemination; *News Media; Newspapers; *News Reporting; *Personnel; Radio; *School Integration; Television
IDENTIFIERS	*Ohio

ABSTRACT

In 1977, two conferences were held for the purpose of providing information and access to resources for news media reporters covering the issue of school desegregation in Ohio. The first conference focused on community response to segregation. A summary of the proceedings is presented in this report. The second conference focused upon desegregation in metropolitan schools. Remarks by one of the speakers and the text of the ensuing discussion are also included here. In addition to accomplishing the stated goals of information dissemination, the Citizen's Council, through these meetings, established itself as a respected source of information on school desegregation for Ohio journalists. Further, it appears that individual reporters are now exercising more care in their coverage of the issues although deficiencies still exist in media coverage of school desegregation issues. Recommendations are offered for improving the quality of reporting. The authors recognize, however, that the climate of desegregation will not change significantly unless national leaders instigate a new agenda for racial justice. Additional items found in this document are a list of conference participants and an extensive listing of resource persons and organizations. (Author/GC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148964

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

[redacted]

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: UD IR

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

The Media

And School Desegregation

Edited by
Rachel B. Tompkins

A Report o. the

Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools

Prepared under Purchase Order No. NIE-P-76-0259

to the

Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools

Interpretations or conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the authors or editor and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Executive Committee, Trustees, or other staff of the Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools.

UD017789

Section I	Preface
Section II	Outcomes and Recommendations
Section III	Community Response to Desegregation
Section IV	Covering School Desegregation
Section V	Attendance Lists for Each Conference Names, station or paper, city
Section VI	Resource Lists

Section I

Preface

The Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools became involved in conferences for the media on school desegregation out of our concern for accurate, timely, clear reporting to parents and citizens on this emotional issue. Our aim was to provide information and access to resources for reporters covering the issue in Ohio.

The first conference was held on April 13, 1977, in Columbus and was attended by 24 reporters and editors from 7 newspapers, 6 radio stations, and 4 TV stations in 6 cities. The second conference was held June 28, 1977, in Cincinnati and was attended by 22 reporters and editors from 5 newspapers, 2 radio stations, and 1 TV station all in Cincinnati. Both AP and UPI wire service sent reporters as did the Cincinnati Magazine. The conferences reached two separate audiences; no one attended both. Those attending the conferences are listed in Section V of this report.

Conference I focused on "Community Response to Desegregation". Featured speakers were Pamela Bullard, Education Editor, Writer, and Producer, WGBH-TV Boston, and Rika Olsen, Boston Media Project. An edited transcript of their remarks and the questions and answers following is included in Section III of this report.

Conference II focused on "Metropolitan School Desegregation". Featured speakers were Robert Manley, attorney and authority on metropolitan legal issues; James Barnes, desegregation plan writer; and William Grant, Education Writer, Detroit Free Press. Mr. Grant's remarks are included as Section IV of this report.

Resource packets were distributed at each conference listing names, addresses, and phone numbers of all local, state and federal officials concerned with desegregation and names of experts on various desegregation related issues. Copies of the resource list are attached as Section VI of this report.

A number of agencies cooperated in preparing for the conferences. The National Institute of Education, Desegregation Studies Section, provided the funds without which nothing would have been done. The Community Relations Service of the U.S. Department of Justice was supportive and offered thoughtful assistance. The Queen City Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi in Cincinnati co-sponsored the meeting there and invited all members of their organization to attend. Luke Feck, President of Sigma Delta Chi and Managing Editor of the Cincinnati Post, was most helpful. A committee of journalists in Ohio also advised the Citizens' Council from time to time. They included Gail Levin, WHIO TV, Dayton; Jay Soloman, WCOL Radio, Columbus; Bill Vance, WBNS TV, Columbus; and Helen Carringer, the Akron Beacon Journal. Judith Bogart, former Director of Community Relations for the Cincinnati Human Relations Commission, advised the Council throughout the planning and preparation for the conferences and made all the arrangements in Cincinnati. The success of the conferences is in large part due to the help of all of these individuals and organizations.

Section II

Outcomes and Recommendations

Covering school desegregation is an extremely difficult task for journalists. Reading reams of court decisions or simply grappling with a 200 page desegregation plan for one city is tedious, time consuming and frustrating. Emotions are high and the media covers the rhetoric of any issue better than the facts. The Citizens' Council efforts to inform the media on school desgregation issues have not changed that general situation.

The informational programs did, however, accomplish the purposes in the original proposal and some other unarticulated goals as well. The original purposes were:

1. To provide useful substantive information on desegregation to reporters, editors, and directors.
2. To provide access to sources not readily available to reporters.
3. To disseminate some lessons from coverage of desegregation in other cities.
4. To discuss reporting on desegregation in the context of general reporting on the schools.
5. To provide an opportunity for reporters, editors, and directors to learn from each other in informal exchange.

Those purposes were accomplished by simply holding the conferences. Two other outcomes grew out of the meetings. The first is that the Citizens' Council firmly established itself as a respected source of information on school desegregation issues for most journalists in Ohio.

1. Reporters in all cities where desegregation is an issue now receive the Desegregation Update, the Citizens' Council periodical providing current information on desegregation. Some had never heard of it or us until they came to the conferences. This was particularly true of the electronic media.
2. Information from the Update is used in news reports. We do not know the exact incidence of this but our files contain several news stories referring to Update stories.
3. The resource lists are used by many reporters. In the wake of the Dayton decision, several reporters called the Citizens Council and the people we had listed as legal experts.
4. Individual reporters call to check a story or ask if we know a person to call on a particular issue or get an update on cases around the country.

The second outcome is that individual reporters exercise more care in writing stories. They check and double check information. As one reporter in Columbus put it: "I think more about what I write on school desegregation than on any other story."

Coverage in Ohio is still less than adequate on court related matters. For example, Dayton papers covered the recent Supreme Court ruling on Dayton well; others did not do as good a job. Consequently, many citizens in the state do not understand the limited impact of that decision. The Council continues to work to correct this problem.

Almost no investigative reporting is done on school desegregation matters. The newer and more subtle forms of resistence to desegregation exercised by some school officials is thus not accurately reported. Covering this area adequately requires a policy change on the part of publishers and station owners. The

Council informative work does not directly address that issue.

The Council's experience with media conferences and our general work with journalists has uncovered two areas in which NIE might consider placing some modest additional resources.

1. Reporting on court decisions around the country is done haphazardly. Some respected place that monitors courts where important decisions are pending, collects the opinions immediately and issues an analysis within 48 hours by press release would be most useful. The Council does some of this in the Desegregation Update, but cannot do it with the speed really necessary to affect immediate media coverage.
2. An annotated list of resource people is a useful document for most reporters. The Council has a beginning list but it needs more work. Most reporters work from a very short list of people to call on any desegregation event. Some limit themselves entirely to the parties to the suit and their attorneys. A few are beginning to realize what Grant so aptly discusses in his presentation in this report: Things are not always what they seem.

Finally, nothing will really alter the general pattern of reporting on desegregation, i.e. discussions of buses, neighborhood schools, white flight, and trouble, until the leaders of this country systematically begin to create a new agenda for racial justice and new phrases to use for discussing the issue. NIE can focus its research agenda on some of the longer range political and social outcomes of an integrated education system. The products of that research would be most useful in recasting the public discussion on race and education.

Section III

Community Response to Desegregation

Summary of the

Media Conference on Desegregation

held

April 13, 1977

Columbus, Ohio

Participating:

Rowland C. W. Brown, Chairman, Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools

Rachel B. Tompkins, Associate Director, Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools

Pamela Bullard, Producer, Reporter, and Education Writer, WGBH, Boston

Rika Olsen, Boston Media Project

Journalists from Ohio cities

Rowland Brown Everything we're doing is sort of a joint learning experience that we're going through together. These are interesting times. The media in all its forms can help all of us learn. I think the way in which the media, at least in the Central Ohio area, has been handling this issue of desegregation has provided a rich learning experience for everybody. They have been very effective. I'm sure they will continue to be. But it's a difficult task. Desegregation is an emotional issue for all of us as individuals--whether we are white or black; wherever we live.

I've just come from chairing a Metropolitan Columbus Schools Committee meeting this morning at which we were concerned about two thorny issues. One is how to deal effectively with what we understand will be a KKK Domestic Nazi Party rally in Columbus. How does one who believes in free speech and exchange of ideas--winning people's minds--deal with organizations who would not only want to win your mind but also I think keep other people from exercising their rights to use their minds and their votes. That is a thorny issue that all of you are going to deal with very soon. I hope you're giving some concern as to how that can be dealt with effectively.

The other thorny issue that we're dealing with this morning--again an issue for all of you as well as for all of us--is the ads that are beginning to appear in newspapers about "look to the Northland". Desegregation means deurbanization--great green pastures North and Deerfield and Turtle Creek and places like that. All of you ought to be thinking about that and its implications for the city.

One of the things that has made Columbus an unusually attractive city in many ways, as an outsider coming into it, is that it's a city that has not lost its identity as a total city. There has been in every

city and every small town in the United States some flight--or if you will, some general migration to greener pastures on the outside of the city. I don't believe that there is any flight of concern in Columbus. In other words, people have not moved out of the center of the city and lost their concern for what's going on in the city in a business sense, a social sense, an economic sense. If that should ever happen, I'm convinced that we would have the same problems that you're seeing in spades in many other major urban areas in the United States.

I was reminded the other day, in reading a speech given by Henry Steele Commanger that our country has always looked to the schools in the way it has looked to churches and synagogues, to mirror the aspirations of where we would like to be as a people, rather that where we are. That leads school administrators and school board members to frequently proclaim, with justifiable frustration, that we are asking them or the Supreme Court is asking them, or their consciences are asking them to do things which we ourselves are not doing in our daily lives in the clubs to which we belong, or the places where we live. Therefore, we're putting a burden on the schools which some people feel is unfair. My position is that one of the requirements that good school administrators and good school board members have to have is to face up to the challenge of our aspirations with good grace.

Rachel Tompkins

Thank you, Rowland. The program today will be structured in a particular way. We will deal first with the substantive issue of community reaction to desegregation and then discuss questions of how to cover that reaction.

Various people are involved and react to what happens in a city as the desegregation process goes on. That includes students, parents, teachers, non-parents, the KKK, and all kinds of other groups who are concerned about the issue for a variety of reasons. Here with us today are two people to help present some of the community reactions

in one city and how they were covered.

Before introducing them, let me suggest to you some of the things we are not doing today. We are not here to give you yet another story about Boston school desegregation for the news today. We are not here to suggest that Columbus is like Boston in that there is likely to be violence. We are not here to suggest that you do not know how to do your job or that you should be controlled in some fashion or the other. We are here, as Rowland said, to learn together, about some of the community reactions and how they might be covered.

With us are two people: Rika Olsen from the Boston Media Project--who is a documentary film maker involved in making films of many people in Boston and their reactions to school desegregation. Beside her is Pamela Bullard of WGBH Television in Boston. She has covered Boston school desegregation issues for five years--partly as a reporter for the Boston Herald American and a free lance reporter for the Boston Globe. She is a desegregation consultant for CBS and PBS and she says that means that she gives them advice on how to cover the Boston school situation which they don't take. Her official title is Producer, Reporter, and Education Editor at WGBH.

Pamela Bullard: You are probably all very wary of this meeting and of me. I always am when I am in your position. When I accepted, I told Rachel that I was all for it and wanted to do it basically because the press failed so miserably in Boston and our failure made the whole situation in Boston a lot worse than it was. We failed, the city failed, the politicians failed and the teachers failed. In spite of all this, education is still going on in Boston but it has been a terrible road as I am sure you all know.

The difference in you being here and talking about desegregation compared to what we went through in Boston was the example about the KKK and the Nazi Party coming in. We knew they were coming into Boston

but we did absolutely nothing about it. There were no community meetings about it; the mayor never met about it; the police never met about it. They came in and marched around in their hoods; they had rallies and intimidated a lot of people; they stirred up a lot of trouble, a lot of tension; and they threw the city into chaos. They had the Grand Dragon, David Duke, there and South Boston and Charlestown loved it. They were there for about a week until finally the police decided to do something about it. They asked them to leave. They left.

They decided to come back. The way Boston handled it the second time was that all around the main access ways to the city we put State Police and National Guard. They simply kept the KKK bus out of the city. So the first time we didn't handle it at all and the second time we had to handle it in a crisis situation.

There are a lot of misconceptions about Boston and desegregation. One thing you have to keep in mind when you consider Boston is that this court order did not fall out of the sky from an over zealous judge. The court order that came down had 150 findings of fact of intentional segregation moves by the Boston School Committee. One hundred twenty of those findings of fact occured between 1965 and 1970.

The argument by Bostonians that neighborhood schools are marvelous and we don't approve of busing has no basis in fact. Prior to desegregation, 38,000 students in Boston were bused to schools. They were bused from white Dorchester--all around black Dorchester and Roxbury--into South Boston. They traveled five to ten miles every day to avoid going to integrated schools. Now in Boston there are 24,000 students bused. The average distance that they are bused is 1.3 miles. Most of the students are bused under one mile in the City of Boston.

When the court order came down, the School Committee was given the option to correct the wrongs and put in their own plan. The School

Committee for six years was under the tutelage of Louise Day Hicks. Her power is immense and intense. Louise Day Hicks can snap her fingers and disrupt South Boston High School. She can do the same thing in Hyde Park and she still does.

When the School Committee failed to come up with any of its own plans, the court was forced to put into effect its own. That turned out to be the most comprehensive desegregation plan that has ever been handed down in the country. It split the city into nine districts, twenty-one magnet schools, and it brought in under court order over two hundred cultural institutions, over sixty universities, over one hundred businesses. It infused close to sixty million dollars worth of federal money into the city to be used in desegregation programs. In spite of it all, there was still disruption.

When schools opened in 1974 in the first phase of desegregation, there were 202 schools. Two schools in the city had trouble--South Boston High and Hyde Park High--but the national news led with it for a whole week. Every evening people were treated to the troubles of South Boston High and that desegregation was a disaster in Boston. Two schools out of 202.

There are still two schools in Boston that have trouble--South Boston High and Hyde Park High. We've now cut down the number of schools. There are 155 schools. So in 153 schools in Boston there is one policeman standing outside of the school, and that's it. But the contrast between that one policeman out in front of English High which has 4,000 students compared to South Boston High which has 600 students is astounding. You walk down the corridor of South Boston High and you walk past State Police holding their rifles like this. They line the corridors. When classes change, the State Police walk in between the students. It's the same thing at Hyde Park High.

Another misconception is this: Boston lost all its white students. Mayor White will tell you that it did. Every anti-busing parent will tell you that it did. The figure they use is 20,000 students. They say before we had 93,000 students. Now we have 73,000 students. Boston and the School Committee and the City, not noted for its honesty, always kept the number of the students high because that's how they got federal and state funds. When Judge Garrity and the teachers did a head count of the actual students attending Boston Public Schools, they found 82,000 students, not the 93,000 that were on all the papers.

So, Boston lost about 9,000 students. About 6,000 of those students were white. Is it because of busing? Sure; we lost several thousand kids because of busing. We also have to realize that Boston has one of the highest tax rates; it has a terrible police force; its services are terrible; the whole State of Massachusetts is in a lot of trouble. If you own a car that's worth $800.00, guess how much it costs you to insure it in the State of Massachusetts. $2,100.00. Boston did lose people, but I don't know if you can say it's all from desegregation.

There are five elements that are part of desegregation in any city: 1) Politics; 2) Court; 3) Police; 4) Parents; and 5) Education.

In Boston, there was the politics of the Mayor, the School Department, the City Council, the School Committee, the Senators, the Congressmen. We even had Jerry Ford involved too.

The Federal Court which was dominant had to take over the whole role of taking care of the schools because the School Committee refused to do so. The School Committee was too busy playing politics.

The police, of course, were a major factor. Desegregation the first year cost sixteen million dollars for education; it cost seventeen million dollars for police. That's State Police, MDC Police, National Guard. It was all overtime and we did have to bring in the Army. The federal

government picked up the tab for the federal marshalls.

The other segment is parents. Parents did not really count during the first year of desegregation. The press was too busy chasing kids throwing rocks. Education was completely forgotten. That is where the press failed. We covered politics; we covered the courts; and we covered the police. We were forced to cover the police a lot. Unfortunately, that was what people wanted and it was the old press cliche of it's much more exciting to take pictures of National Guardsmen walking down the street than it is of a kid learning how to read.

So we failed. We completely forgot about these two elements--parents and education. What happened was that parents in the background were hard at work, making education work. They didn't care about the press, the politicians, the federal court, the police. Maybe it is to their advantage that we did ignore them. In concentrating so much on the first three factors, however, we gave the picture to the world that Boston was a terrible place--that education was a disaster--that kids were not learning how to read and write. That just is not true.

The court order was an impetus to improve education in Boston. Education was terrible, not only for black students but for white students. Black kids did not have pens; they did not have remedial reading; they had the worst teachers; they had the worst administrators; their buildings were falling apart. Those buildings are improved but education has improved for the white teachers and the white students.

The politics has come out of the system to a large degree and the federal court has, as the Superintendent says, "kicked us in the ass and made us move." So education is better. Reading scores are up in Boston. Reading scores prior to desegregation were seventeen months behind the national norm. We're now only eleven months behind the national norm. It is progress.

Rika Olsen: Let me tell you first about the Boston Media Project and how it started. The Ford Foundation asked George Stony Associates if they would look into the possibility of going to Boston and seeing what they might be able to do using video tape in an educational fashion. In the Fall of 1975, George Stony and Jim Brown went to Boston, talked to people in the media, talked to people in communities, in the schools, and realized that they could be of service.

Taking video equipment and going into communities and talking to parents and students, using very low cost tape, very portable equipment, they could compile information that would be of interest to media people, useful in various different parts of the community, in crossing barriers with information that was very low key and very forthright. They devised a project whereby they would first tape a conversation with many people and bring to the attention of the media some of the parents that were story worthy in the experiences that they were having. Second, the tapes could be used in other neighborhoods to show what was happening to people throughout the city. Third, the material would be used with other cities to show community reactions to desegregation.

To find the kind of people that we talked to and get them to trust us involved a whole methodology. We went to meetings in schools and talked initially to two or three parents. We played back what parents had said in one meeting to parents in another. We were able to spend time in the community, warm people up to opening up, and talking to the camera by showing them other people who had voiced their opinions.

When we were taping these people, they knew they were not going to be seen that night on television. Some parents who talked openly about ways in which they were harrassed were promised that those tapes would not be shown in Boston. We tried not to focus a community around one given person. We went to meetings that were already going on,

organized around something else and showed some of our tapes and arrived at real grass-roots people, because they didn't come to see what we were doing. They were there because they were involved in something else. I think we really did get to people who otherwise would not have come to the attention of the media.

Let me describe how we have worked with the media in Boston. One TV station came in and looked through our tapes, found people that had certain strengths and then we put them directly in touch with the people they had seen. I visited one woman in her home while the taping was done to put her at ease. Having a television group come into your home can sometimes be very intimidating. So we worked together on it and the station was able to capitalize on the trust we had built up.

One of the things that was brought to our attention over and over again by parents who had got involved was that the frustrations that they went through caused them to become mutually supportive. Parents from different neighborhoods of Boston came together at a given school because their kids were going to that school. They suffered the alienation in their own neighborhoods from parents who were anti-busers. They decided to send their children anyway. Some real integration happened on a parent level too and a little support system got built up. I think that's a newsworthy event. The media might have picked up on that and focused a little attention on the kind of work they were doing and some of the success stories.

Questions and Answers

Question: How do you keep your ear to the ground?

Pamela Bullard: How do you keep your ear to the ground? How do you find out what's going on? So you avoid the problems Boston had? First we had to be where the violence was unfortunately. But the press not focusing on education and parents was a failure of legwork. Many of us just did

not do our homework. We never expected what was going to happen in Boston. I am very wary of people who say, "well, the press caused the disturbances" because the disturbances and the violence where people got hurt, happened far away from the cameras. We weren't there. We didn't see it. We had no idea it was going to be so bad. We didn't make the community contacts; we didn't go to the meetings; we didn't get to know the people.

I mean it's a matter of time. We did some of that but it involved myself and another reporter spending weekends and nights in the communities. I mean literally walking the streets, finding people to talk to. From there you start to talk and you start to meet people. I don't know how the attitude towards the press is in Columbus, but the white community and to some extent the black community, has very little use for the press in Boston. The black community disapproves of us because they thought we were showing only the negative aspects of desegregation. The white community thought that we were showing only the positive aspect of desegregation. So we had no friends in either community. It's just a lot of legwork. You go out there and for every dozen people you talk to you've got one person you can believe in and who you trust. And you spend a lot of time in living rooms and at breakfast tables just talking. That's how we got to the grass-roots. We made an effort to do it to get away from the politicians and the press conferences and so-called leaders.

It takes a lot of time and a lot of effort to go through a massive desegregation plan and understand every nuance. Many of my colleagues opted not to do that. It was easier not to. It was easier to say, Let's do Southy."

Question: Were parents who appeared on TV harrassed?

Olsen. We spoke to one of the women who was on television. They interviewe her in her home and she also joined in several audience participation shows. She had already been harrassed to some degree. She is now a target in that neighborhood. While we were there doing the follow-up taping to show how she can handle the situation a year later, eggs were thrown at the window. But I would say it could have happened more extensively. One of the things I worry about is, how much did that intimadate other parents?

Question: Did you back off when people were harrassed?

Bullard: Yes, there were some instances where we would back off because of that. That is not a valid reason why contact wasn't made with more community people. Many of the schools opened peacefully and very politely. The parents would say, "Hey, you know, everything's fine. The school's running Okay. Would you get your bloody cameras out of here!" And we would go along with that.

Question: Do you think there was too much coverage in Boston? Too much made of it?

Bullard: Let me give you an example. Let me answer your first question first. Was there too much coverage? Charlestown High has 600 students. It has had little problem with desegregation. There were six kids in Charlestown High that used to talk out of class, walk through the corridors, do a little bit of disrupting, nothing serious. The principa would say, alright, out of the school. They would march out of the schoo go to a phone, call up the news media and say, "We've had it with this desegregation--we're going to march to City Hall and we're going to straighten this thing out." They would carry a couple of signs and it was six kids, and maybe they'd pick up another dozen or so people. They would march to City Hall, do absolutely nothing, the cameras would follo them the whole way. The six o'clock news every night. Six kids out of

600 in a school out of 74,000 in the system. Was there too much coverage? Yes. Why cover that? I mean what does it matter? But they covered it day after day after day--and it happened three or four times a week. Walter Cronkite and John Chancellor covered it.

One of the problems with desegregation is that you can't cover it like a fire or a Russian trawler coming into port.

Maybe once, I would let the anti-busers talking about blacks being animals go on. You don't let parents harangue about the animals because it is not true. What you do is perpetuate a fear. Louise Day Hicks and all the politicians stand up and scream about the crime in Roxbury. How long do you let the cameras grind away and let them scream when they're doing it just for the camera? They're doing it just to stir things up. You have to make an editorial judgement which makes the press very unpopular.

Question: I've seen very little in the media, national or anything about what is happening inside schools in Boston. Is the plan producing something that's more exciting than what existed before? Are we getting something different at the end of the bus ride or the end of the walk that wasn't there before? Are there things that are happening as far as an adjustment for a kid in terms of their getting into the school routines and so forth? Isn't this where most of the people are concerned?

Bullard: That's where you have to stop covering the politicians and cover educational programs. That is not nearly as exciting. If parents don't have any positive feedback of what's happened to the educational system, then it seems to me we're only doing half the job and the half we've done is the worst part of it.

It is difficult to know how to proceed, however. The media in Boston got together and said, "Okay, we're gonna be responsible and we're going to look at the programs and the education and really tell the

people what's going on." That got out to the community and the anti-busers and they just tore that apart. They presented this as the media conspiring to tell them what was going on. It completely backfired. The whole project was dismantled because we were guilty of conspiracy.

Comment: I'm disturbed by some of the things I'm hearing and I'm disturbed as a newsman. Telling the community what it wants to hear is not necessarily our job. By the same token, we all have biases and I think we ought to be able to set those biases aside and deal with the facts. And while part of this is myth and so on, that myth is a fact too. Louise Day Hicks is a fact and we have to deal with that. Whatever is in our community, we deal with it. In looking at it in perspective and exercising editorial judgement, we keep doing things in proportion to what they actually are in the real world. If they represent 10%; they ought to get about 10% of the attention. That's the kind of business we ought to be in.

Another thing that I've been hearing here that I find very disturbing is that newsmen do not have community contacts. Maybe it was true of Boston. If it is, it's a real black mark against the media in Boston. If we're sitting around as newsmen and we don't have any contacts in the community, we're drawing our pay under false pretenses. I know people that I can call in my community in various neighborhoods and find out what's going on in that neighborhood. That's my job. I can talk to them in confidence and they have confidence in me that what they say to me is not necessarily going to be a 72 point headline in the next day's paper, because that isn't the way it works. And if we're doing our job, we are going to be able to go out there. We aren't going to have to spend six months to find out there are common people in the world. Maybe if other people haven't been doing that job, they'd better get on the stick because I would hope that most of the media people that are in the education things are getting

out in schools. Now. Before something happens. They know some of the people there, they know some of the kids there, they know the school principals. I've been in every school in my community at one time or another. If you're covering the schools and you have not been in every one of the schools that you're covering, you miss the boat somewhere.

Bullard: What would happen if you were covering that school and it turned into a South Boston High? What aspect would you cover then?

Comment: Well you have to cover what happened. And you deal with the violence but you also deal and keep that in proportion and perspective as to what the whole picture is.

Bullard: Okay, it was not kept in proportion in Boston.

Comment: Implicit in your comments is some desire or suggestion that you redefine news, that the news media should become a counterforce to combat political systems. I've covered desegregation in six communities during my career. In every case,I can tell you when there was a bad political structure and poor planning, there was trouble. When there has been good political structure, the thing has worked. I think this community is lucky in that sense in that at least there's not a terribly big vacuum that seems to be waiting for somebody that's got a big mouth to fill. What does bother me that somebody seems to be suggesting that we, if there were a bad political structure, that we would be expected to counteract that. Once you've done the story about some people want to make this work; that story's been done. If you do it three times in a row on three successive days, you suddenly become propagandists. You have no chance to perform a news function. I won't redefine news to cover a story.

Comment: I agree with that point. One of the things that strikes me is that the media covers a story over time--a story that has big flurries and big pauses. One of the things that I'm curious about is what do you cover in the pauses. You do the one story on something good that's going on and that's

about what it deserves. That's about its level of newsworthiness. You can't do that every couple of days. But there's a lot of time when nothin is going on except kids are going to school and everything's moving along. What do you do during that period of time? What do you come back to a story that was a big flurry once upon a time and may be a big flurry again. How do you come back in that period of time and cover it? And the reason I ask that question is that I read one newspaper pretty much all the time and I watch one or two TV news stations pretty much all the time. I get most of my news from those couple of sources over a year. If I only see the coverage during the flurries and there's not a lot during the pauses, and that positive stuff does go on during all those big pauses, I get the impression that all that happens is the flurries. That's my concern.

Comment: We're still largely a reactive media. More so in television than in any other because of our reduced staff. We don't have the time. I can maybe devote half of a person out of my total staff to work education all the time. That's a basic fact of life we're dealing with here too. I don't have people to spring full time to go out on the streets. That would be great. If I had a larger staff, I would have at least five of them working the education beat. I think other people in this room are in that same position. A small radio station with two people on the street has got a hell of a time trying to do that.

Question: You haven't mentioned radio at all. What was good and what was bad in Boston? About radio coverage.

Bullard: Actually, the radio coverage was superb. We have WEEI Radio and they, unlike television, had all the manpower and resources. They had people spread all over the city and were doing live feeds constantly. I depended on it a great deal and I know that a lot of other journalists did. The feeds were excellent.

When there was trouble in Boston, it had a tendency to fan out and you'd have mobs of kids over here and mobs of kids other here and it would take over a whole community like South Boston and they'd bring in the Mounted Police on one side and the National Guard on the other. It was very bizarre. It took three reporters to cover it. Because you didn't know where they were going to move next. And radio was doing all the live feeds right from the location.

Question: Isn't that a little dangerous?

Bullard: In what sense?

Question: Well, giving live coverage to a live situation?

Bullard: If it was television, yes, but not radio. Many people in the working class community do not tune in to an all news radio station. And that was the one that was doing the live feeds. I don't think it was. It served as an informational service. We have tremendous radio in Boston. And every station also did half hour and hour talk shows with all the different principals and brought in parents. They did very, very well.

Question: What is in the news now in Boston?

Bullard: You go weeks without seeing a school story. No, I'm sorry, not this time of year. It's spring. And there's trouble beginning again in Southy and Hyde Park; so it's back in the news. During the winter you go weeks without hearing anything about it. Boston stations are the same as every other station. They've had to cut back severely in staff. The money hasn't been there. The money is going into electronic journalism and not into manpower and so they have not had the option.

Question: What would you say about covering the Klan when the Klan comes to Columbus?

Bullard: They're fun to cover because they're so outrageous. We got the Grand Dragon and he put on quite a show. I mean the Klan is a fact.

The Klan comes to town and you've got to cover it. It depends on what happens. If he wants to walk through the streets in a robe and walks out then it makes it easy for you. He did not do that in Boston.

Question: How do the police deal with the media in Boston? Does the Chief have someone who will speak for him?

Bullard: No. DeGrazia spoke for himself and during desegregation he said that his police officers could not talk to the media. He was the one that you spoke to and his men were not to speak to us.

Question: But did he make himself available?

Bullard: Yes. Very available and he's very outspoken. He was a real reformer and very progressive and was not afraid to say what he thought. We now have a new police chief who is much more conservative. We're having problems. He won't let us talk to his men and he is not as accessible.

Question: Did papers and stations try to set up rumor control?

Bullard: Yes. We had a basic information center.

Question: Did it work?

Bullard: No. Because it was run by the school department.

Question: What happened when Southy became a story? Were other schools covered at all?

Bullard: Yes. When school opens in Boston in the Fall, every reporter who works for any media or newspaper outlet works that day. Unless they are a specialist, they begin the day working on desegregation. They are out at the school with a camera and crew or if they're in print, they're out in the community. It's all geared to that and so you get a lot of different stories coming in. When Southy really blew, it was a matter of resources. You just moved all of your resources over to Southy. But they fooled us and they made Hyde Park blow up and then Charlestown and we couldn't catch up with them. We were just chasing after them.

Question: How much did the media in Boston play to each other?

Bullard: A great deal. We all get along very very well and we've learned a tremendous amount during this.

Question: No. I mean in covering something just because another station or paper was

Bullard: There was a certain amount of that but everyone felt that it was an event. The difference between the stations and newspapers was how much play they gave it. One newspaper would take a demonstration and make it Page 1. Another newspaper would put it on Page 6.

Question: So someone would be afraid, too, not to lead with it if that was the day's story. Is that it?

Bullard: Oh, I don't think so. No. We have very individual news directors. I don't think there was any "Well, he led with it, we'll lead with it." It was very individual.

Question: You talked about the news media being accused of controlling the news when they talked to each other. Yet on the other hand, you talked about people controlling the news by creating news. How can you get away from being controlled?

Bullard: You are going to be controlled. You are going to be used because you are the only game in town to the anti-busers and the pro-busers. It comes down to what type of perspective to put on each segment. How important are you going to make one side as opposed to another side. The facts dictate to you. If you have an easy time in Columbus--which I certainly hope you do--it will be much more difficult for you to decide what to cover. We were covering a police story a lot of the time and if you're not covering that here then you're going to have to make harder decisions.

Question: What kind of planning did the media do in Boston?

Bullard: The first year, we were not top. The whole city wasn't. The court order came down on the 21st. The student assignments didn't come out

until two weeks before the buses rolled. It was chaos that first year. The media couldn't know because the city didn't know because the court didn't know and because the state hadn't made up its mind.

Question: We here in Columbus, it seems to me, are waiting find out who's going to be hurt by this thing. No one really knows. I noticed we have a lot of civic and other groups that are formed, working toward peaceful acceptance of whatever may come. But it gets a little awkward when these people hold a news conference as they did on the day the decision came. They said, "we are all for peaceful acceptance of whatever decision"--and beyond that there seemed to be very little to be said because nobody really knew what the decision was going to be; nobody really knew who was going to suffer or benefit from whatever might happen. It seems to me there's going to come a point in the future where the crunch comes--when everybody finds out exactly what this thing is going to mean to them personally.

Bullard: That's exactly what we did. We learned on June 21st that we were going to get it.

Comment: Right. But until you know that and until that happens, you aren't going to be getting the reaction throughout, whatever the reaction may be.

Bullard: Well, you must have a pretty good idea from the different community groups where they're coming from, I mean what, if they're going to be adversaries or friends.

Comment: To my knowledge, there aren't too many groups here in Columbus that are standing up and saying "we are adversaries; we're against whatever might happen...."

Bullard: We didn't have that problem in Boston. (Laughter)

Comment: The media in Dayton did a super job letting people know exactly how it was going to affect each and every one of them. They ran, informational stories to try to stop the rumors, to try to make sure the facts

were getting out. That is one of the most important things any media in any town can do, is to use their skills to help people understand how it will really affect them and stop rumors. Just stop them from starting.

Question: How do you report about white flight?

Bullard: It's a fact. It's a fact either way, isn't it? It's a fact if you have white flight. I would report that. Or it is a story if nobody is moving because everyone thinks they will. Conventional wisdom is that there will be tremendous white flight.

Comment: Just because the "for sale" signs go up does not mean the constituency in the community will move. You first have to sell your house. So I thin you could blow that story up by saying "we have one thousand signs going up" and white flight will increase. You might want to wait until people have in fact moved. And you have to go back now to student enrollment in terms of attendance, not just numbers on rolls. We talked to the realtors in Dayton to get them to see the need not to have all the signs up necessarily. You can sell your house without a sign you know.

Boston was very helpful to Dayton in that all of what you didn't do in Boston for whatever reason, we thought we ought to do. We viewed Boston not as negative but what Boston didn't do would help Dayton to be successful.

Bullard: I am glad we were of help. (Laughter)

Section IV

Covering School Desegregation

Edited Remarks--William Grant

Education Editor
Detroit Free Press

Media Conference on Metropolitan School Desegregation

held

June 28, 1977

Cincinnati, Ohio

Participating:

Rachel B. Tompkins, Associate DIrector, Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools

Robert Manley, Attorney and authority on metropolitan legal issues

James Barnes, Desegregation plan writer

William Grant, Education Writer, Detroit Free Press

If you did not know if before you came, covering school desegregation is not possible. Simply, the media are not designed, not made to cover issues like this. We cover best those issues that have a beginning, an end, and are relatively clear cut. The fire started at 6:00 a.m., burned out of control for three hours and is now out. We can cover that. That is what we were designed for, to transmit that kind of information. We do not cover at all well one of these global issues that extends over time. It is particularly difficult for broadcasting because of their time and visual and sound requirements.

Nick Flannery who used to be the Director of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and the Center for Law and Education at Harvard and now is in private law practice in Boston said once that reporting on a school desegregation case is like covering a baseball game because both are just a series of unexplained pauses.

The Detroit case started in 1970 in the midst of a bitter controversy over steps the local school board had taken to change the racial composition in eleven of the city's 300 schools. It was not until January, 1976, that the first desegregation plan was implemented. That plan has been ruled by the Court of Appeals to be inadequate and at some point must be expanded. So the Detroit case, at this point, almost exactly seven years from the date it was filed has made a great deal of legal history. It has produced, now, two major Supreme Court decisions. It has resulted in virtually no change in the schools of Detroit. It has, however, produced what has been considered by most to be the largest single political controversy in Michigan--at least in this century.

Most writing and reporting about Detroit and other local school cases, deal with each development along the line as if this is the end or very

nearly the end. Early decisions are always dealt with in terms of what this means with regard to busing. Busing is just around the corner. This whole process is long--unbelievably long and complicated. Something will happen today in the courts; a thread of that will be picked up months later and something even later on down the line will relate to that. You are unlikely in any of your careers to write the end of this story to which you have written the beginning.

The second reason desegregation is an almost impossible issue to cover is that things seldom are what they seem to be. What we in the media cover best, is the rhetoric of the issue. We cover the speeches of the people on both sides--the bombastic utterances of the civil rights group on the one hand, and the school boards on the other. We usually do not cover at all, and if we do, we do not cover very well, the reality of the issue.

It is all well and good for the mothers of Northeast Detroit to be out marching saying no not never--and their position needs to be reflected in our reporting. Journalists also need to understand in terms of covering the good mothers that their viewpoint, their position, their statements, have virtually no significance at all in terms of what is and what is not going to happen. What is or what is not going to happen is determined much less visibly; in courts, and in Congress, and in school boards and all of those places that journalists have determined are too complicated and too unexciting to cover. Yet it is there that the reality of the issue is taking place.

Let me give you a couple examples of what I consider missing the forest for the trees. It is almost impossible to write stories about Supreme Court or other court decisions that you have not read. Yet most of us during our reporting lives are called upon, sometimes frequently, to do that.

Frequently, the first news of the decision turns out to be wrong.

I have not read the Dayton decision (June 27, 1977, Supreme Court decision) although I have had part of it read to be on the telephone. I have read the major part of the Supreme Court decision on Detroit yesterday. I am inclined to believe that we will discover that the Detroit decision is of much greater significance in the global sphere of things. Following Detroit, I think it is probably fair to say that it will become fairly routine for federal judges to include various kinds of educational programs. In-service training of teachers has been virtually a routine order as part of the desegregation plan, but now I think it will become routine that orders will go beyond that because the opinion by the Chief Justice yesterday in the Detroit case, speaks at some length of the need for remedial reading and other kinds of programs to overcome the effects of the segregated school system.

Secondly, I think as a result of Detroit, more states which have been found themselves to have participated in the guilt will be ordered to participate in the remedy in various ways, but most importantly in providng money. This of course is important in Ohio because the state is involved in most if not all of your cases here.

Concerning Dayton, I will say to you what a lawyer friend of mine who works for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights said to me yesterday. "We did not advance the ball an inch but we didn't lose an inch." It is my impression from having heard it read to me that the Supreme Court actually said a system-wide plan must be supported by system-wide findings. The first A.P. story I saw of the decision, which began to appear about 10:20 a.m. said the Dayton plan had gone too far and a more limited plan was required. That is one of those situations where it may be technically right, but it may be actually wrong.

Anybody with any experience in journalism knows that under those kinds of circumstances, the wire service stories are being written by the reporter on the telephone at the same time he is reading the opinion for the first time. There is absolutely no thought or reflection there at all. The ethic of the wire services is to get it out first. They worry about the niceties of and the nuances of meaning later on. So the A.P. story came out first; U.P.I. followed and the C.B.S. network news last night reported essentially what wire services said.

Yet there were two clues that would suggest this is not a major change in Supreme Court rulings. The system wide plan was left in effect for another year. That ought to say something to you. The opinion was unanimous. That ought to say something else to you. It could very well be that the same plan will be operating in Dayton a year from now.

I do not know what the Dayton papers will say. School board people in Cincinnati quoted in this morning's newspaper clearly feel that they have been let off the hook or are about to be let off the hook. I think when you read the Dayton opinion you will find that the hook is still there and most everybody is still hanging on it. So things are frequently not what they seem.

As another example, I remind you that the major breakthrough case in northern school desegregation, the Denver case, was just as widely misreported. The Supreme Court handled it in a way that obscured its importance. Part of our purpose in the media must be to see through that obscurity and try to say on an almost immediate basis what the lawyers have some latittude in terms of time to say "this is what in fact they did".

In Denver, the Supreme Court made a decision that said, "we are extending the principles of Brown and other southern desegregation decisions to the North." If they had intended to do that in a fashion which nobody would

recognize, they could not have come up with a better plan for doing it than they did.

Number one, they handed it down on the same day as their major obscenity rulings of the 1973 term which meant immediately that nobody paid attention. All the reporters focused on the obscenity case. Secondly, they said in the Denver case "This case is remanded to the District Court for further proceedings." That was a clue, to reporters covering the Supreme Court that day not to worry about Denver because it was going to go back on some technicalities. The obscenity decisions were the decisions of note.

As it turns out, the obscenity decisions will keep changing year in and year out and Keyes is still there having made a major impact on all of the northern school cases. The decision of the Supreme Court that day in the Denver case did in fact say fairly clearly to those who read it that the standards of proof which several federal courts at that point in Pontiac and in Denver and in various other cases had been using to determine that a school system was guilty of illegal segregation were appropriate. That meant to those who were familiar with those cases that any northern city in which this kind of evidence could be gathered could be found guilty of segregating the schools. Therefore, the North was in fact open to school desegregation orders. The story appeared on page 28 of the New York Times.

Things are frequently not what they seem to be. You have all been caught up in the legal confusion over what is and what is not racial imbalance. The courts you will discover tell you that racial balance is illegal. Congress has said you cannot have racial balances. The Supreme Court consistently says we will not approve plans that have racial balance. Yet they approve plans routinely which have every school in the district approaching a percentage of minority students in the district as a whole.

Now I submit to you the average mother and father may see appreciably little difference between a starting point, which is what the courts in Charlotte referred to, and racial balance; but, nonetheless, you need to understand that. You need to understand that even today when the Congress of the United States routinely passes its anti-busing legislation and sends out its press releases and letters to constituents about how we have stopped busing. You have to understand that the Congress is writing the laws that say we prohibit racial balance; but that they are playing games and leaving things as they are. They are able to convince people because frequently reporters help them convince people that they are doing something they are in fact not doing.

There are various legal cul de sacs. In Detroit one was whether or not suburban districts can themselves be involved in the plan simply by virtue of the fact that the State has been found guilty. In other words, the suburbs themselves were not involved in the court proceedings, were not found guilty of doing anything; but the suburbs were included in the remedy as mere legal instrumentalities of the State. Can the State of Michigan be ordered to produce an effective desegregation plan for the City of Detroit using whichever of its local units of government that are necessary to do that? The Supreme Court said "no". Now in Detroit you are faced with the ultimate issue of finding 80 plus suburbs guilty at some future point. Most people in Detroit today still don't realize that the metropolitan issue is a live issue.

Beyond those difficulties of our nature and the issues themselves, there are some others. All of you have had people come to you and say essentially this: "If you would write this or if only you would broadcast this, then people will understand." The argument is essentially that if you would write that desegregation works or has worked; if you would write the law is this; or if you would write that the realities were this; then

the people will understand and the politicial difficulties will go away. Well, that is naive.

I want to remind you of some important things that communications research have told all of us. The media do not have the power to make public opinion. I want to be understood on that. We do not have the power to make the public think what we want them to think. The media does have important power to a substantial degree to set the public agenda. We determine by what we write about and what we broadcast what people are talking about. We determine what issues are important--the issues that are going to be focus of public debates. We don't really go beyond that. We don't make up peoples' minds for them. We don't make people for or against desegregation by what we write. We may make them aware of the desegregation issues. They make up their minds for a whole host of reasons, some of which relate to us and some of which do not. Now, that is a finding so elementary in communications research that I have taken it for granted and I have found that it was dangerous to take for granted.

A year ago, I spoke at a seminar at Michigan State which was made up mostly of educators and researchers and a few lawyers and I said that in a matter of fact way and then offered some other points. Well, that was really my blind side because I was clobbered, chopped up, and spit at by the people there for speaking such heresy. They simply knew that the media was at fault in making people be against busing. If we would only quit writing what we were writing and write something different people would think different things.

It was an interesting experience for me because to be technical for a minute, one of the reasons that we don't make up peoples' minds for them is the process called reduction. People read what we write, hear what we broadcast, through their own filters of prejudice and so,

therefore, they hear what they want to hear. That is demonstrated all the time by people calling you up and thanking you for stories you know do them no good. But they are hearing what they want to hear. So here I was clobbered by a room full of researchers who knew I had that power and I would not exercise it. I not only would not exercise it, I was telling them I did not have it. So you know, we should not be so naive as to think that what we write or what we say makes people think differently.

For a few minutes, I would like to talk about nuts and bolts. It does not make any difference whether you are covering a school desegregation issue limited to a single district or a metropolitan issue. Here in Cincinnati and, in fact, the whole state of Ohio you are going to have to cover school desegregation as an issue. There's a metropolitan part of that issue and there are local district parts of that issue. Some districts in Ohio may never really get involved in discussing any sort of serious metropolitan plan; others will. But you are going to have to cover school desegregation. Four or five years ago Michigan was in fact the key battle-ground for desegregation in the north with five cases. Now Michigan is mostly a model of operations with a few H.E.W. proceedings against districts. The focus of the civil rights effort you will find has shifted to Ohio. How do you deal with that, recognizing the well nigh impossibilities that I have mentioned.

I suggest that you need to have some sort of plan--some sort of internal plan. By plan I don't mean you need to decide the position you are going to take or to decide whether you are going to cover demonstrations or not cover demonstrations. I mean you need to have a good repertorial plan on how you are going to cover this. We all have plans on how you cover city government and how you cover the courts. In many cities, desegregation becomes a beat but since it is not in the normal beat structure everybody

covers it on sort of an ad hoc basis and you are pulling stories out of your back pocket without having to bother about how you are going to do it. Well, I suggest that you sit down now and try to develop some sort of plan for how you are going to cover it. Are you going to cover it off an education beat? Are you going to cover it out of the court beat? Are you going to cover it out of a combination?

I regard myself as very lucky--overworked frequently--but very lucky to have had the good fortune over seven years of the Detroit case to have been in charge of writing about it and actually doing most of the writing. That doesn't happen on a lot of papers. Many have chopped it up so that the education writer covers what the school board does and the court reporters cover what happens in court. I think you need to know that if you do that you lose some sense of the wholeness of the issue, you lose some sense of continuity. People are writing about bits and pieces of it without being able to see the whole picture. It will probably be necessary to have more than one person involved. There ought to be at least one person, whether a reporter in charge of the team or an editor in charge of keeping the big picture in mind.

Having done that, you need to background the issue as much as you can. Find out everything you can about desegregation and your local school district and your local case. I am appalled that most of the stories that are written about desegregation are written by people that have never read the court decisions and have no familiarity with the court decisions. Most reporters have not even read the local court decisions. I would encourage you as you develop some sort of concept of who is going to cover it to make reading the decisions--tedious work though it is frequently--part of your work. Go back and read the major decisions and if you are ambitious you can go back further and read the early decisions. Read the two Brown

decisions and some others. Read the more recent one and you will begin to develop some feel for the nuance of those things so that when you read the future decisions you will have some ability to understand what is new and what is not.

You have to recognize that just because it is a court opinion does not make it true. Court decisions frequently say things that are not correct. They say things that are said for their own purposes. You have to be aware of why the court is saying what it is saying and what it is not saying. The Supreme Court in the Detroit case in 1974, misstated the issues and misstated the decisions of the lower court. Whether or not they did it purposely or not is beside the point. What they did was essentially adopt the statement of issues and the statement of the way the lower court had proceeded that was advanced by the suburban districts. In other words, to arrive at the conclusion the court arrived at required framing the issues in a certain way. In fact, they did misstate what the district judge had done and misstated his purposes. You need to be aware that the Supreme Court of the U.S. may feed you a line. You can tell only by having read enough court decisions and knowing enough about the law to recognize when a number is being run on you.

Frequently, none of this work I suggest produces stories. This is the hard thing. You can sit and read court opinions for a week and not have come up with a single useful story. This is a price you pay in covering desegregation well.

ATTENDEES AT SECOND MEDIA CONFERENCE - 6/28/77

Mr. James I. Adams
Metro Editor
Cincinnati Post
800 Broadway
Cincinnati, Ohio

Mr. Robert Benjamin
Reporter
Cincinnati Post
800 Broadway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Mel Berning
Researcher
WCET - TV
1223 Central Parkway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45214

Mr. Art Botterell
Reporter
WKRC - Radio
1906 Highland Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio 45219

Mr. Tom Brinkmoeller
Reporter
Cincinnati Enquirer
617 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

Ms. Anne C. Carter
Coordinator-Student Concerns
Cinn. Human Rel. Comm.
City Hall, 9 & Plum Streets
Cincinnati, Ohio 45203

Mr. John W. Chace
Assistant City Editor
Cincinnati Enquirer
617 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Ms. Mary Jean Connors
Assistant City Editor
Cincinnati Enquirer
617 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Dennis L. Dressman
City Editor
Cincinnati Enquirer
617 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

Mr. Bill Furlow
City Editor
Cincinnati Post
800 Broadway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Richard Gibeau
Reporter
Cincinnati Post
800 Broadway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Greg Hand
Editor
Western Hills Press
1329 Arlington Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45225

Mr. Arthur F. Hill
Director-Community Affairs
C. G. & E.
P. O. Box 960
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

Ms. Tommie C. Jones
Conciliator
U.S. Dept. of Justice
Community Rels. Service
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

Mrs. John W. Kemp
Staff Writer
Forest Hills & Com. Journals
564 Cincinnati-Batavia Pike
Cincinnati, Ohio 45245

Mr. John Kiesewetter
Reporter
Cincinnati Enquirer
617 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Kerry Klumpe
Reporter
Cincinnati Enquirer
617 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Andrew Lippman
Correspondent
Associated Press
617 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Leslie Major
Editor
Cincinnati Magazine
120 W. 5th Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Thomas E. Niehaus
Executive Editor
The Press Newspapers
1329 Arlington Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45225

Ms. Mary Jane O'Donnell
Producer WCET
1223 Central Parkway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45214

Ms. Adele M. Plasterr
Public Relations Coordinat
Cinn. Human Rels. Comm.
Rm. 110 - City Hall
Cincinnati, Ohio

Mr. Robert San George
Reporter
UPI
800 Broadway
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Mr. Mark Scheerer
News Director
WEBN
2724 Erie Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio 45208

Ms. Barbara Zigli
Education Reporter
The Cincinnati Enquirer
617 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Section V

ATTENDEES AT FIRST MEDIA CONFERENCE - 4/13/77

Mr. Steve Adams
Dayton Journal Herald
4th and Ludlow Streets
Dayton, Ohio 45401

Mr. Bob Albrecht
Columbus Dispatch
34 S. Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Dave Claborn
WTVN Radio
42 E. Gay Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. James T. Connor
WKYC TV
1403 E. 6th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Mr. Ray Dittman
WBNS Radio
62 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Mr. Charles G. Fenton
Columbus Citizens Journal
34 S. Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Ms. Michelle Gailiun
WCMH TV
Olentangy River Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Mr. Phil Gardner
WCOL Radio
22 S. Young Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Ms. Sandra Hausman
WCOL Radio
22 S. Young Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Terry Jessup
WCMH TV
54844 Dunfield Lane
Columbus, Ohio

Mr. Howard W. McKinney
U.S. Community Relations Serv.
U.S. Department of Justice
175 W. Jackson Blvd., Rm. 1113
Chicago, IL 60604

Mr. Bill Pepper
WBNS TV
770 Twin Rivers Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Jerry Revish
WBNS Radio
62 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Mr. Ed Ross
WBNS TV
770 Twin Rivers Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Ms. Micki Seltzer
Columbus Call & Post
109 Hamilton Ave., Box 2606
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Mr. Bob Singleton
WCOL Radio
22 S. Young Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Ms. Marilyn Smith
WOSU
2400 Olentangy River Rd.
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Mr. Richard Trembath
WKYC TV
1403 E. 6th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Mr. Jay Solomon
WCOL Radio
22 S. Young Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Richard Townley
WCMH TV
3165 Olentangy River Rd.
Columbus, Ohio 43202

Mr. Bob Gibsen
Lima Daily News
121 E. High Street
Lima, Ohio 45802

Mr. Jon Greiner
WRFD Radio
Columbus, Ohio 43285

Ms. Tommie C. Jones
U.S. Community Rels. Servi
P. O. Box 458
Dayton, Ohio 45402

Mr. Richard McBane
Akron Beacon Journal
44 E. Exchange Street
Akron, Ohio 44328

Ms. Lisa Meyer
WJW Radio
13461 Ridge Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44133

Mr. William Thomas
Youngstown Vindicator
298 Corriedale Drive
Cortland, Ohio

Section VI

Resource Lists

Desegregation Resource People

I Legal Issues

William Taylor
Director, Center for National Policy Review
School of Law
Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C.
(202) 635-5140
(History and current Supreme Court legal issues)

Norman Chackin
Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights
Washington, D.C.
(202) 628-6700
(History and current issues; also national legislation)

David Parham
Study Group on Racial Isolation
Cleveland, Ohio
(216) 241-1880
(Cleveland case; other current legal issues)

Robert Manley
4500 Carew Tower
Cincinnati, Ohio
(513) 721-5525

II Plan Preparation

Robert Dentler, Dean
Boston University College of Education
Boston, Massachuesetts
(617) 353-3210
(Expert who developed Boston plan and other plans)

James E. Barnes
Director, General Assistance Center
Univeristy of Hartford
Hartford, Connecticut
(203) 522-7166

Don Johnson
Superintendent
Saulsalito, California
(415) 332-3190
(Formerly Assistant Superintendent, San Francisco, who supervised plan development there)

Michael Stolle, Dean
School of Education
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
(414) 963-4181
(Has assisted in plan development in many cities including Milwaukee)

III Monitoring Commissions

James Breedon
Director
City Wide Coordinating Council
Boston, Massachusetts
(617) 426-2450

Lila Carol
Mershon Associate
Mershon Center
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
(614) 422-1681

Judith Bogart
Consultant
Dayton Citizens Advisory Board (1976)
Dayton, Ohio
(513) 621-6266

IV Parent and Citizen Involvement in Desegregation

Mary Ellen Smith, Director
Al McMahill, Deputy Director
Citywide Education Coalition
Boston, Massachusetts
(617) 864-2835

Marcia Pitcole, Director
Coalition for Peaceful Integration
Detroit, Michigan
(313) 864-8500

Frank Rose
Lamar Society
475 L'Enfant Plaza, West
Washington, D.C.
(202) 554-5949

Mardi Osman
Lamar Society
475 L'Enfant Plaza, West
Washington, D.C.
(202) 554-5949

V Magnet or Alternative Schools

Thomas Fagan
Equal Educational Opportunities Program
400 Maryland, S.W.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 245-8489
(Federal assistance to magnets; generally knowledgeable about alternatives)

Donald Waldrip
3986 Rose Hill Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio
(513) 221-5224
(Former Assistant Superintendent, Dallas and Superintendent, Cincinnati who developed alternative programs; now consultant to cities developing desegregation plans)

Richard Foster
655 S. Elisoe Drive
Apt. #1
Greenbrae, California
(451) 461-4410

Daniel U. Levine
Center for the Study of Metropolitan
Problems in Education
School of Education
University of Missouri
Kansas City, Missouri
(816) 276-2251
(Evaluator and author of several articles on magnet schools)

Nolan Estes
Superintendent, Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas
(214) 241-4045

Muriel Harris
Superintendent, Community District 9
J. M. Curley School
Pershing Road
Jamaica Plaines, Massachusetts
(617) 522-3595

VI Research on Desegregation

Gary Orfield
Professor of Political Science
University of Illinois
Champaign/Urbana, Illinois
(217) 333-1000
(History, federal legislation, urban population trends, housing, desegregation implementation)

Christine Rossell
Professor, Political Science
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts
(617) 353-2540
(White flight, mayor's role in desegregation; Boston monitoring)

Robert Crain
RAND
Santa Monica, California
(213) 393-0411, ext. 7160
(Politics of desegregation, implementation problems, costs)

Meyer Weinberg
School of Education
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
(312) 592-9465
(Outcomes for students)

Reynolds Farley
Sociology Department
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan
(313) 764-1817
(White flight, urban population trends)

Michael Giles
Political Science Department
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida
(305) 395-5100
(Private schools, urban population trends)

Michael Ross
Abt Associates
Boston, Massachusetts
(617) 492-7100
(Attitudes, citizen reaction to desegregation, Boston)

Everett Cataldo
Chairman, Political Science Department
Cleveland State University
(216) 687-4540
(Metropolitan issues, white flight, private schools)

VII Second Generation Problems

Paul Smith
Childrens Defense Fund
The Washington Research Project, Inc.
1520 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
(202) 483-1470

Larry Brown
Massachusetts Advocacy Center
2 Park Square
Boston, Massachusetts
(617) 357-8431

Districts in Court

CLEVELAND

School Officials

Title	Name	Telephone No.
President, School Board	Arnold Pinkney	(216) 795-1995
Superintendent	Paul W. Briggs	(216) 696-2929
Deputy Superintendent (Chief of Desegregation Planning Team)	James R. Tanner	(216) 696-2929
Assistant Superintendent Community Relations	Conella C. Brown	(216) 696-2929

Court Appointed Officials

Master	Daniel R. McCarthy	(216) 696-1422
Experts	Edward A. Mearns	(216) 368-2098
	Gordon Foster	(305) 284-3213

Community Organizations

Director, NAACP	James Stallings	(216) 241-2664
Director, Greater Cleveland Project	Leonard Stevens	(216) 621-5925
Chairman, Study Group on Racial Isolation	Rolland Smith	(216) 861-6100

Attorneys for Parties

Defendents - Local	Charles F. Clarke	(216) 696-9200
- State	Mark O'Neill	(216) 241-6602
Plaintiffs	James Hardiman	(216) 241-6660
	Thomas A. Atkins	(617) 267-1058
	Nathaniel Jones	(212) 245-2100

Districts in Court

DAYTON

School Officials

Title	Name	Telephone No.
President, School Board	William Goodwin	(513) 278-2573
Superintendent	John Maxwell	(513) 461-3850
Assistant Superintendent for Student Services	William Goff	(513) 461-3850
Desegregation Task Force Coordinator	James Eschbach	(513) 461-3850
Public Information Director	Susan Kurczewski	(513) 461-3850

Court Appointed Officials

Chairman, Dayton Citizens Advisory Board (Monitoring Commission)	Robert Kegerries	(513) 873-2311
Master	John Finger (Rhode Island College)	(401) 456-8000

Community Organizations

President, NAACP	Richard Austin	(513) 222-2841

Attorneys for Parties

Defendants' - Local	David Greer	(513) 223-3277
	Leo Krebs	(513) 223-3277
Plaintiffs	Richard Austin	(513) 222-2841

Districts in Court

YOUNGSTOWN

School Officials

Title	Name	Telephone No.
President, School Board	Ralph Clark	(216) 743-1151
Superintendent	Robert L. Pegues, Jr.	(216) 743-1151
Coordinator of Urban Affairs	Emanuel G. Hallaman	(216) 743-1151

Community Organizations

Director, NAACP	Roland Alexander	(216) 744-3711
Executive Director, Educational Opportunity Now	Judy Fornear	(216) 744-0208
President, Educational Opportunity Now	Bishop Wm. A. Hughes	(216) 744-8451

Attorneys for Parties

Defendants - Local	Joseph Vouros Asst. City Law Director	(216) 746-1892
- State	Eugene Green	(216) 743-5101
Plaintiffs	Thomas A. Atkins	(617) 267-1058
	Nathaniel Jones	(212) 245-2100
	James Hardiman	(216) 241-6660

Districts in Court

COLUMBUS

School Officials

Title	Name	Telephone No.
President, School Board	Steven Boley	(614) 861-1533
Interim Superintendent	Joseph Davis	(614) 225-2888
Assistant Superintendent-Instruction	Howard Merriman	(614) 225-2715
Director of Public Information	Beverly Bowen	(614) 225-2814

Community Organizations

President, NAACP	Olas Dunson	(614) 252-4983
Chairman, Metro Columbus Schools Committee	Rowland C. W. Brown	(614) 444-2121
Executive Director, Metro Columbus Schools Committee	Donald Pierce	(614) 228-3733

Attorneys for Parties

Defendants - Local	Samuel Porter	(614) 228-1511
- State	Mark O'Neill	(614) 241-6602
Plaintiffs	Leo Ross	(614) 221-5525
	Richard Stein	(614) 221-4221
	Thomas Atkins	(617) 267-1058
	Nathaniel Jones	(212) 245-2100

State Officials and Organizations

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Title	Name	Telephone No.
Superintendent of Public Instruction	Franklin B. Walter	(614) 466-3472
Assistant Superintendent (Desegregation litigation)	G. Robert Bowers	(614) 466-2329
Assistant Superintendent Urban Education (Federal assistance for desegregation and urban education)	Robert O. Greer	(614) 466-5834

KEDS GENERAL ASSISTANCE CENTER

Director (Federally funded center providing assistance to school districts on desegregation)	Dr. Robert Evans	(216) 672-2828

CITIZENS' COUNCIL FOR OHIO SCHOOLS

Associate Director	Rachel B. Tompkins	(216) 621-5220

FEDERAL OFFICIALS

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Civil Rights Divison

Alexander C. Ross, Chief, Education Section
(202) 739-4092

Jeremiah Glassman, Staff Attorney (Cleveland Case)
(202) 739-3844

Community Relations Service

Gilbert C. Pompa, Acting Director
(202) 739-4045

Richard A. Salem, Midwest Regional Director
(312) 353-4391

Tommie C. Jones, Conciliator
(513) 225-2524 (For information on Cleveland and Dayton)

Howard McKinney, Conciliator
(312) 353-4391 (For information on Columbus and Youngstown)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office for Civil Rights

David Tatel, Director, Office for Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
(202) 655-4000

Lou Mathis, Public Affairs, Headquarters, Washington, D.C.
(202) 245-4970

O. O. Barr, Chief, Elementary and Secondary Education, Region 5, Cleveland
(216) 522-4970

Kenneth Mines, Regional Director, Chicago
(312) 353-2520

Office of Education

Dr. Herman Goldberg, Associate Commissioner, Equal Educational Opportunity Programs
(202) 245-8484

Louis M. Irons, Branch Chief, Equal Educational Opportunity Programs, Region 5
(312) 353-7200

(For information on Emergency School Assistance Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act)

P. Max Gabbert, Assistant Regional Commissioner, Elementary and Secondary Education
(312) 353-7330

(Region 5 for Health, Education, and Welfare includes Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconson, and Indiana. We recommend calling regional offices first.)

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Education Equity Unit -- Desegregation Studies
Ron Henderson, Acting Director
(202) 254-6271

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Arthur Flemming, Chairman, Washington
(202) 254-8130

John Buggs, Staff Director
(202) 254-8130

Caroline D. Glieter, Deputy Chief, Office of Program and Policy Review
(202) 254-6604

Clark G. Roberts, Chief, Midwest Regional Office, Chicago
(312) 353-7371